


International Journal of

Sustainable Development and Planning

Encouraging a unified approach
to achieve sustainability



Volume 12, Number 3, 2017



WITPRESS

**SPECIAL
ISSUE**



Objectives

The **International Journal of Sustainable Development and Planning** responds on the necessity to relate the fields of planning and development in an integrated way and in accordance with the principles of sustainability.

The Journal covers all aspects of planning and development including environmental design, planning and management, spatial planning and sustainable development.

It is the aim of the editors of the Journal to create an interdisciplinary forum where all the issues related with the concept of sustainability (environmental, spatial, economical and social), are open for scientific discussion.

COORDINATOR

C.A. Brebbia

Wessex Institute, UK

INTERNATIONAL EDITORIAL BOARD

K. Aravossis

*National Technical University,
Greece*

A. Balducci

AESOP, Italy

J. Barnes

*University of the West of England,
UK*

S. Basbas

*Aristotle University of Thessaloniki,
Greece*

E. Beriatos

University of Thessaly, Greece

H. Bjornlund

*University of South Australia,
Australia*

C. Booth

*University of the West of England,
UK*

C. Borrego

University of Aveiro, Portugal

R. Brandtweiner

*Vienna University of Economics and
Business, Austria*

S. Brody

Texan A&M University, USA

Ni-Bin Chang

University of Central Florida, USA

M.E. Conti

University of Rome, Italy

M. Cunha

Universidade de Coimbra, Portugal

L. D'Acerno

*'Federico II' University of Naples,
Italy*

A. Gospodini

University of Thessaly, Greece

K.L. Katsifarakis

*Aristotle University of Thessaloniki,
Greece*

H. Kawashima

University of Tokyo, Japan

E. Larcán

Politecnico di Milano, Italy

D. Longo

University of Bologna, Italy

G. Lorenzini

University of Parma, Italy

G.K. Luk

Ryerson University, Canada

I.G. Malkina-Pykh

*Russian Academy of Sciences,
St Petersburg, Russia*

S. Mambretti

Politecnico di Milano, Italy

Ü. Mander

University of Tartu, Estonia

J.F. Martin-Duque

Universidad Complutense, Spain

M.A. Martins-Loucao

University of Lisbon, Portugal

J.L. Miralles i Garcia

*Universitat Politècnica de
València, Spain*

M. Mohssen

Lincoln University, New Zealand

V. Pappas

University of Patras, Greece

F. Pineda

Complutense University, Spain

U. Probstl-Haider

BOKU, Austria

D. Proverbs

University of Birmingham, UK

R.M. Pulselli

University of Siena, Italy

G. Reniers

University of Antwerp, Belgium

S. Riley

*Teritary Engg & Sustainable
Technology Pty Ltd, Australia*

G. Rizzo

Università di Palermo, Italy

G. Rodriguez

*Universidad de Las Palmas de Gran
Canaria, Spain*

R. Rojas-Caldelas

*Universidad Autonoma de Baja
California, Mexico*

F. Russo

*University of Mediterranean Reggio
Calabria, Italy*

S. Samant

*National University of Singapore,
Singapore*

M. Sepe

University of Naples, Italy

R. Sjoblom

*Tekedo AB / Luleå University of
Technology, Sweden*

J.H.R. van Duin

*Delft University of Technology,
The Netherlands*

J-Z. Xiao

Tongji University, China

M. Zamorano

University of Granada, Spain

International Journal of

Sustainable Development and Planning

Encouraging a unified approach
to achieve sustainability

Volume 12, Number 3, 2017

SPECIAL ISSUE

The Sustainable City

GUEST EDITORS

Carlos A. Brebbia

Wessex Institute of Technology, UK

Antonio Galiano-Garrigos

University of Alicante, Spain



WITPRESS
Southampton, Boston

PUBLICATION AND OPEN-ACCESS FEE

WIT Press is committed to the free flow of information to the international scientific community. To provide this service, the Journals require a publication fee to be met by the authors or the research funding bodies for each paper published. The fee in this Journal is €130 per published page and is payable upon acceptance of the paper. The paper will then be Open Access, i.e. immediately and permanently free to everybody to read and download.

FREQUENCY AND FORMAT

The **International Journal of Sustainable Development and Planning** will be published in eight issues per year in colour. All issues will be supplied to subscribers both online (ISSN: 1743-761X) and in paper format (ISSN: 1743-7601).

SUBMISSIONS

The **International Journal of Sustainable Development and Planning** is a refereed journal. In order to be acceptable for publication submissions must describe advances made in one or more of the topics listed on the right or others that are in-line with the objectives of the Journal.

If you are interested in submitting a paper please contact:

**INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF
SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING**
WIT, Ashurst Lodge, Southampton, SO40 7AA, UK.
Tel: 44 (0) 238 029 3223, Fax: 44 (0) 238 029 2853
Email: carlos@wessex.ac.uk

TYPES OF CONTRIBUTIONS

Original papers; review articles; short communications; reports of conferences and meetings; book reviews; letters to the editor and selected bibliography. Papers essentially of an advertising nature will not be accepted.

AUTHORS INSTRUCTIONS

All material for publication must be submitted in electronic form, in both the native file format and as a PDF file, and be PC compatible. The text area is 200mm deep and 130mm wide. For full instructions on how to format and supply your paper please go to:

www.witpress.com/authors/submit-a-journal-paper

SAMPLE COPY REQUEST

Subscribe and request your free sample copy online at:
www.witpress.com/journals

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

2017: Vol 12, Issues 1 – 8,
Online and print access US\$1900.00

- ◆ Sustainable development
- ◆ Rural planning
- ◆ Urban planning
- ◆ Urban and regional design
- ◆ Ecosystems analysis and protection
- ◆ Natural resource management
- ◆ Coastal planning and policy
- ◆ Waste management
- ◆ Environmental infrastructure
- ◆ Air, water and soil pollution
- ◆ Remediation and recovery
- ◆ Geo-informatics and the environment
- ◆ Environmental impact assessment
- ◆ Environmental economics
- ◆ Environmental legislation and policy
- ◆ Tourism and the environment
- ◆ Social issues
- ◆ Resources management
- ◆ Planning in less favoured areas
- ◆ Regional economics
- ◆ Utilities and networks
- ◆ Energy resources
- ◆ Education and health
- ◆ Cultural heritage issues
- ◆ Visual impact and noise pollution

ISSN: 1743-761X (on line) and ISSN: 1743-7601 (paper format)

© WIT Press 2017.

Printed in Great Britain by Printondemand Worldwide.

PREFACE

The papers contained in this issue are a selection from those presented at the Urban Regeneration and Sustainability Conference held in Alicante, Spain, organised by the University of Alicante and the Wessex Institute of Technology.

They address many multidisciplinary issues of urban planning, which result from the increasing size of cities, the amount of resources and services required and the complexity of modern society. The continuous process of urbanisation generates many problems, which need to be resolved by the cities becoming more efficient habitats, whilst improving the quality and standard of living of their residents.

Most of the earth's population now lives in cities and the process of urbanisation continues to generate many problems deriving from the drift of the population towards them.

The rapid growth of cities has traditionally generated an unbalanced urban development where the centre of the city becomes neglected while its surroundings are anonymous spaces. The lack of adequate mobility between different parts of the city and a lack of balance between their uses generate functional instabilities in the urban context and situations of abandonment and insecurity.

In response, the level of occupancy of the urban space diminishes and its inhabitants no longer identify with their built environment.

Situations of abandonment and improper use show up in the decreasing quality of public spaces and well-being of residents.

The strategy consists of finding solutions that allows restoring a balance between the different uses of the urban fabric, improving transport infrastructure and especially improving the quality of life in urban space so that all stakeholders develop a sense of ownership and belonging.

The process however faces a number of challenges such as reducing pollution and improving transportation and infrastructure systems. New urban solutions are required to optimise the use of space and energy resources leading to improvements in the environment.

Large cities are probably the most complex systems to manage. However, despite such complexity, they represent a fertile ground for architects, engineers, city planners, social and political scientists, and other professionals able to conceive new ideas and timely implement them according to technological advances and human requirements.

The challenge of planning sustainable cities lies in considering their dynamics, the exchange of energy and matter, and the function and maintenance of ordered structures directly or indirectly supplied and maintained by natural systems.

The papers published in this issue, as well as all others presented at the Wessex Institute Conferences are archived in the Institute's eLibrary (witpress.com/elibrary) where they are permanently available to the international community.

The Editors
Alicante, 2016

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL PERFORMANCE OF AN OFFICE BUILDING USING BREEAM AND GBL

WEI CHENG¹, BEHZADSODAGAR²& FEIFEISUN³

¹School of Urban and Architecture, Wuhan University of Science and Technology, China.

²School of Architecture and Design, University of Lincoln, UK.

³Department of Energy and Environmental Design, NPS Group, UK.

ABSTRACT

With rapid economic growth and urban expansion in China, the Chinese building sector is now facing the huge challenge of balancing its energy demand and pollution. In order to minimise the environmental impact, the Ministry of Housing Urban-Rural Development (MOHURD) has set an ambitious energy reduction target requiring that 30% of all new constructions to be green by 2020. This paper presents comparative analysis of two environmental rating systems: the latest version of Chinese Green Building Label (GBL 2014) released by the MOHURD in order to promote the market transformation of green buildings and Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM 2014), the widely recognised environmental assessment methodology in the global construction industry. To compare the two environment assessment standards, a public office building currently under construction in Fujian (China) has been used as a case-study to rate its environmental credentials using both BREEAM and GBL.

Results have shown that although both standards use a similar methodology, they require different levels of input data and may result in different ratings for the same building.

Keywords: BREEAM, carbon emissions, energy consumption, environmental assessment methods, environmental impacts, GBL, green buildings, LCA.

1 INTRODUCTION

The construction industry is a major contributor to climate change [1] as it is responsible for almost half of the global greenhouse gases and consumes 40% of the materials entering the global economy [2, 3]. The effect of carbon emissions on climate change can arguably be seen as the greatest impact and therefore of the most urgent priority [4]. As a result the construction industry has become increasingly concerned with understanding the whole life impact of buildings as it is increasingly required to declare the greenhouse gas (GHG), carbon footprint or business CO₂ emissions [5]. In addition to investigating and monitoring the effects of buildings on climate change, it is also important for the research community to investigate the effects of climate change on future energy consumptions of buildings as consumptions will change under future climate scenarios [6]. As worldwide population grows and hence more buildings will be needed, one may assume that the construction industry will continue to increase its carbon dioxide emissions unless it changes its practice [4]. This has resulted in energy efficiency in buildings to become a main criterion for energy policy in many countries.



This paper is part of the Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Urban Regeneration and Sustainability (Sustainable City 2016)

www.witconferences.com

Table 1: Classification of building environmental assessment methods.

Assessment tool			Tool type	Country	Developer	Year
BEES			LCA	USA	U.S. National Institute of Standards and Technology	2002
ATHENA TM			LCA	Canada	ATHENA Sustainable Material Institute	1997
BEAT			LCA	Denmark	Danish Building Research Institute	1999
Eco-Quantum			LCA	Netherlands	IVAM, University of Amsterdam	1999
BREEAM			CBT	UK	Building Research Establishment (BRE)	1990
LEED			CBT	USA	U.S. Green Building Council	1998
Green Star	CBT	Australia	Green Building Council Australia		2003	
CASBEE	CBT	Japan	Japan Sustainable Building Consortium		2004	

In this context, the concept of green building plays a significant role in focusing on increasing energy efficiency, sustainable use of resources and moreover enhancing health and wellbeing of building users. In order to assess the environmental performance of the design and build, a number of codes, standards and assessment rating systems have been developed. The codes, standards and procedures have created lively debates and increase awareness within the building industry globally about the actions required to tackle climate change [4]. For example, the EU proposed the Energy Performance Buildings Directive (EPBD)

In 2002 to monitor and to reduce energy use, Brunsgaard et al. [7] analysed how the main EPBD was implemented by EU participating countries. Sharifi and Murayama [8] proposed a review of 7 well-known building environmental assessment tools worldwide with a view to introduce a framework for evaluating the effectiveness of existing tools. Haapio and Viitaniemi [9] analysed and categorised 16 existing building environmental assessment tools focusing on the tools developed in Europe and North America. According to Ali and Al Nsairat [10], there are two types of building environmental assessment tools: (i) method based on criteria-based tools (CBT) and (ii) method based on the Life Cycle Assessment (LCA). Table 1 lists a few widely used assessment tools using CBT or LCA approaches.

The aim of LCA method is to evaluate the environmental impact of products and processes during their whole life span from cradle to grave [11], as used for example in assessment tools such as BEES (Building for Environment and Economic Sustainability, USA), ATHENATM (Canada), BEAT (Building Environmental Assessment Tool, Denmark) and Eco-Quantum (Netherlands). LCA methods can be used as a decision making support to analyse complex and different sets of alternatives during the design phase with the purpose of optimising materials, energy use, waste management and transportation options. Because of very specific and technical language of most assessment tools specialists professions are usu-

ally their main user groups [10, 12] limiting the wide spread use of tools as most stake holders and decision-makers in the building industry are not specialists enough to initiate the assessment process in all projects. It is therefore crucial to facilitate the use of assessment tools and also promote use of intelligible assessment tools capable of creating easy and simple interaction with potential clients on the market [13]. To achieve truly sustainable buildings there must be a co-coordinated approach involving all stake holders including the client, the industry and local authorities and government [4]. It is also important to realise that in order to minimise carbon emissions, assessments should be carried out at the outset of the design when refinement of design strategies and options have the maximum potential of reducing whole life emissions [5]. Ford *et al.* [14] argue that without the involvement of the building users (clients) in the design to identify their needs and goals it will be difficult to judge which of energy saving concepts and measures perform well and which do not work at all.

As a 'checklist approach', criteria-based tools (CBT) are more widely accepted and globally used throughout the life-cycle of buildings [15]. To this end, this study analyses the potential of CBT in the environmental assessment of buildings.

CBT methods are based on a system of allocating points to determine credits and classes by evaluating environmental loads [10]. Among the first criteria-based environmental assessment tools is BREEAM (Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method) which was established by the Building Research Establishment (BRE) in the UK in 1990. BREEAM has been used to assess the environmental credentials of buildings over 70 countries worldwide [16]. LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) is another widely used assessment tool developed by the U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC) in 1998 with registered projects in covers 30 different countries [17]. Another CBT is the Green Star, a national voluntary environmental rating tool which was launched in 2003 by the Green Building Council of Australia (GBCA) [18]. In Japan, CASBEE (Comprehensive Assessment System for Building Environmental Efficiency) was set up by the Japan Sustainable Building Consortium (JSBC) in 2004 aiming to promote eco-efficient buildings by evaluating the environmental loads and the environmental quality and performance during the life cycle [19].

One of the reasons for comparing GBL and BREEAM in this paper is that an increasing number of buildings are certificated under BREEAM in China as well as due to the fact that GBL2014 is developed based on principles and methodology used in BREEAM.

2 AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

The aim and scope of this paper is to review the role of assessment methods in the design and procurement of sustainable buildings and to compare the predicted performance of an office building under construction in China using two widely used assessments methods in China, i.e. BREEAM and GBL.

3 SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

The research uses quantitative analyses and investigations. BREEAM and GBL rating methods have been examined and used for assessing the sustainability credentials of a case study office building in China. BREEAM has provided a benchmark for a range of building types in the UK. New rating of Outstanding was introduced in 2008 [16] to further reward the best examples. The use of whole life assessment tools are becoming more popular as new buildings constructed to more stringent energy efficiency targets will have a higher ratio of embodied emissions to operational, and this situation will only become more acute as both

domestic and non-domestic buildings are designed to meet zero carbon targets [20].Even in buildings designed to be zero carbon in use and attempt to have low embodied emissions by substituting alternative materials such as replacing cement with lime, embodied emissions remain significant [21].

BREEAM assesses the environmental performance of design and build by allocating scores to nine technical sections. The sections are management, health and wellbeing, energy, transport, water, materials, waste, land use and ecology, pollution. Scores gained from each section are weighted by the ‘environmental weightings’, which reflects the relative importance of each section.The weighted scores are then added up to obtain the overall score, which has a base of 100 points.The category ‘Innovation’ can be achieved with 10 additional points [16].The number of points obtained determines the final level of the certification. There are five progressive levels of certification: Pass, Good, Very Good, Excellent and Outstanding (Table 2).

In 2006, the Chinese Government released the first national green building assessment standard–GBL. As a CBT, it was developed by Society for Urban Studies and administrated by the Ministry of Housing Urban-Rural Development(MOHURD). The new version 2014 of this standard came into force on 1st January 2015 in order to help achieve the national target in China requiring 30% of all new constructions to be green by 2020 [22]. GBL is classified into five sections being: Landscape, Energy efficiency, Water efficiency, Material and resource, Indoor environment. Similar to BREEAM, GBL certification is a point-based score rating with a percentage weightingsystem. Likewise BREEAM, ‘Innovation’ can also be gained in GBL with 10 additional points. There are three ‘classes’ of certifications in GBL being: one-star, two-star or three-star, with three-star being the highest achievement (Table 2).

Figure 1 illustrates the sections in BREEAM and GBL from which scores may be obtained. Due to different number of sections in each method and in order to make the comparison

Table 2: Sections and levels of BREEAM and GBL.

	BREEAM	GBL
Categories and Weighting	Management 12%	Landscape 16%
	Health and Wellbeing 15%	Energy efficiency 28%
	Energy 15%	Water efficiency 18%
	Transport 9%	Material and resource 19%
	Water 7%	Indoor environment 19%
	Materials 13.50%	Innovation (additional) 10%
	Waste 8.50%	
	Land use and ecology 10%	
	Pollution 10%	
	Innovation(additional) 10%	
Levels of certification and score	Pass 30–44	one-star★50–59
	Good 45–54	two-star★★60–79
	Very Good 55–69	three-star★★★80+
	Excellent 70–84	
	Outstanding 85+	

Table 3: Redistribution of credits to the new sections for BREEAM.

Land Use and Ecology		10.00%
• LE01	Site selection	2.00%
• LE02	Ecological value of site and protection of ecological features	2.00%
• LE03	Minimising impact on existing site ecology	2.00%
• LE04	Enhancing site ecology	2.00%
• LE05	Long term impact on biodiversity	2.00%
Transport		9.00%
• Tra01	Public transport accessibility	3.75%
• Tra02	Proximity to amenities	1.50%
• Tra03	Cyclist facilities	1.50%
• Tra04	Maximum car parking capacity	1.50%
• Tra05	Travel plan	0.75%
Energy		15.00%
• Ene01	Reduction of energy use and carbon emissions	5.81%
• Ene02	Energy monitoring	0.97%
• Ene03	External lighting	0.48%
• Ene04	Low carbon design	1.45%
• Ene05	Energy efficient cold storage	0.97%
• Ene06	Energy efficient transportation systems	1.45%
• Ene07	Energy efficient laboratory systems	2.42%
• Ene08	Energy efficient equipment	0.97%
• Ene09	Drying space	0.48%
Water		7.00%
• Wat01	Water consumption	3.89%
• Wat02	Water monitoring	0.78%
• Wat03	Water leak detection	1.55%
• Wat04	Water efficient equipment	0.78%
Materials		13.50%
• Mat01	Life cycle impacts	5.80%
• Mat02	Hard landscaping and boundary protection	0.96%
• Mat03	Responsible sourcing of materials	3.86%
• Mat04	Insulation	0.96%
• Mat05	Designing for durability and resilience	0.96%
• Mat06	Material efficiency	0.96%
Health and Wellbeing		15.00%
• Hea01	Visual comfort	4.09%
• Hea02	Indoor air quality	3.41%
• Hea03	Safe containment in laboratories	1.36%

Table 3: (continued)

●	Hea04	Thermal comfort	2.05%
●	Hea05	Acoustic performance	2.73%
●	Hea06	Safety and security	1.36%
Pollution			10.00%
●	Pol01I	mpact of refrigerants	2.31%
●	Pol02	NOx emissions	2.31%
●	Pol03	Surface water run-off	3.84%
●	Pol04	Reduction of night time light pollution	0.77%
●	Pol05	Reduction of noise pollution	0.77%
Waste			8.50%
●	Wst01	Construction waste management	3.80%
●	Wst02	Recycled aggregates	0.94%
●	Wst03	Operational waste	0.94%
●	Wst04	Speculative floor and ceiling finishes	0.94%
●	Wst05	Adaptation to climate change	0.94%
●	Wst06	Functional adaptability	0.94%
Management			12.00%
	Man01	Project brief and design	2.29%
	Man02	Life cycle cost and service life planning	2.29%
	Man03	Responsible construction practices	3.42%
	Man04	Commissioning and handover	2.29%
	Man05	Aftercare	1.71%




Figure 1: Sections of certification for BREEAM and GBL.

between the two methods more meaningful, five shared sections based on universal environmental impacts were identified for both methods. There are landscape, energy and atmosphere, water, materials, indoor environment. The new weightings (%scores) were counted by adding up the individual scores of each section for BREEAM (Table 3) and GBL (Table 4) and in accordance with the aspects embedded in the new five sections identified for both methods.

Table 4: Redistribution of credits to the new sections for GBL.

Landscape		16.00%
● Lan01	Landutilization	5.44%
● Lan02	Outdoor environment	2.88%
● Lan03	Transportation and public services	3.84%
● Lan04	Site design and site ecology	3.84%
Energy efficiency		28.00%
● Ene01	Building and envelope	6.16%
● Ene02	HAVC	10.36%
● Ene03	Lighting and electrical system	5.88%
● Ene04	Energy utilisation	5.60%
Water efficiency		18.00%
● Wat01	Water-saving system	6.30%
● Wat02	Water-saving utensils and facilities	6.30%
● Wat03	Utilisation of non-traditional water resources	5.40%
Material and resources		19.00%
● Mat01	Material-saving design	7.60%
● Mat02	Material selection	11.40%
Indoor environment		19.00%
● Ind01	Indoor acoustic environment	4.18%
● Ind02	Indoor lighting environment	4.75%
● Ind03	Indoor thermal environment	3.80%
● Ind04	Indoor air quality	6.27%

Table 5: New sections and score (%weighting) for BREEAM and GBL.

	Landscape ●	Energy and atmosphere ●	Water ●	Material ●	Indoor environment ●
BREEAM	24.4(27.7%)	19.6(22.3%)	7(8.0%)	22(25.0%)	15(17.0%)
GBL	16(16.0%)	28(28.0%)	18(18.0%)	19(19.0%)	19(19.0%)

The colour coding used in Tables 3 and 4 relates to the five new sections as shown in Table 5. The new five sections were standardised on the basis of 100 once the new weightings (%scores) were set up (Table 5).

The performance reactivity for BREEAM and GBL is shown on the histogram in Fig.2. BREEAM allocates more points to the landscape section as compared with the other 4 sections. Table 3 demonstrates there are 13 issues included in thelandscape(red colour) allowing for factors related to the sustainability of the landscape choice such as ecology and amenity issues. In GBL more attention has been paid to land utilisation (Lan01) accounting for 34% of the total scores allocated to the landscape section (Table 4). The




Figure 2: Comparison new sections between BREEAM and GBL.

main reason for emphasising this aspect in GBL is due to the shortage of available land in China.

The energy and atmosphere performance in BREEAM emphasises on reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, such as CO₂ and NO_x [16]. This section in GBL attracts the highest portion of scores, 28% of total scores (Table 5). There is a considerable difference in the level of scores allocated to water in the two methods. BREEAM focuses on reducing the demand for potable water, while GBL focuses on optimising water-supply. GBL has higher water weighting compared with BREEAM.

Material is the second most prioritised section after landscape in BREEAM in order to minimise the environmental impacts, reducing waste and promoting sustainable sourcing of materials. Indoor environment section relating to lighting, acoustics, thermal and air quality, is a common area in both methods and the weightings are relatively similar.

In our study, we have not included management and innovation in the composition of the new five sections. This is due to the fact that management, a category existed in BREEAM for managing the service quality, is not linked to any environmental credit. As for innovation, it is an additional category existed in both BREEAM and GBL. So by excluding the management and innovation in our analysis, the quantifiable results are not affected in terms of environmental sustainability. This has resulted for the total maximum possible scores achievable in the five new sections in BREEAM equate to 88 while the corresponding figure is 100 in CBL (Figs 4 and 5).

4 PILOT STUDY

The building selected for the study is 105m tall, 30 story public office building (named building C82), located in Fujian, China, which is currently under construction (2016) and due to be completed by the end of 2017 (Fig. 3). Table 6 lists some characteristics of the building. The area of the site is 13,300 square meters. The building has a total floor area of 109,860 square meters, of which 25,678 square meters is underground. Four public transport stations are near the entrance of the site, with walking distances less than 500 meters to the building. The building is made of reinforced concrete with fully glass curtain walling facade. The building is equipped with varied refrigerant volume (VRV) air conditioning system with condensation heat recovery fresh air unit. Rainwater is collected and stored in an underground tank for reuse as gray water after being flocculated, filtered and disinfected, for purpose such as irrigating the landscape, road cleaning and garagewashing. Gray water is not used for flushing toilets.

BREEAM and GBL require energy performance of the design against a 'Notional building' by using the approved simulation tools according to each standard [23, 24]. For BREEAM,



Figure 3: The case building-‘C82’.

Table 6: Summary information for ‘C82.

Location	Fujian,China
Gross floor area	109,860 m ²
Site area	13,300 m ²
External wall U-value	1.02 W/m ² K
Window U-value (include glass curtain wall)	2.25 W/m ² K
Roof U-value	0.573 W/m ² K
Heat/cooling generator	Heat pump
Thermostat	Summer25°C
settings(designed)	Winter18°C

the ‘Notional building’ has been defined in the NCM2013 [25] and the simulation software ‘Energyplus’ was used to examine energy performance of the building. For GBL, the ‘Notional building’ has been defined in the national standard GB50189-2015 [24] and ‘PKPM’, the most widespread software for analysing dynamic energy consumption in China, was applied to evaluate the energy performance of the case study building.

5 RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

This section discusses the main differences in the composition of total score calculated by BREEAM and GBL methods for the building case study. Table 7 present the results obtained from our analyses. The building is classified as ‘Good’ with 50.93 points for BREEAM and two-star with 63.66 points for GBL. The correlations between the results for the corresponding categories can be seen in Figs 4–6. The landscape category encourages sustainable land use as well as better access to sustainable means of transport for building users. The two methods appear to show relatively close scores for the landscape category. The case study building has archived a score of 14.63 in BREEAM out of the




Figure 4: Score achieved in C82 related to maximum score of the new BREEAM’s sections.




Figure 5: Score achieved in C82 related to maximum score of the new GBL’s sections.

Table 7: Results of BREEAM and GBL for the building ‘C82’ GBL.

	BREEAM	GBL
Section Score	Management6.00	Landscape11.04
	Health and Wellbeing11.04	Energy efficiency15.12
	Land Use and Ecology5.00	Water efficiency15.84
	Transport5.25	Material and resources10.26
	Energy6.77	Indoor environment11.40
	Water3.88	Innovation(additional)0
	Material7.71	
	Waste1.88	
	Pollution7.69	
	Innovation(additional)0	
Final score	50.93	63.66
Rating	Good	★★

maximum available 24.4 (Fig.4) representing 60% achievement (Fig.6). GBL has estimated a score of 11.04 out of a possible maximum 16 (Fig.5) representing a 70% achievement (Fig.6).

According to the results for energy and atmosphere section, similar performance is ascribed to the building C82 by the dynamic simulations, but we can see BREEAM gives fewer points than GBL for this category as seen in Figs 4 and 5. Because the two schemes are based on different energy assessment methods, 46% of the total scores (9.07 out of 16.9 as in Fig. 4)




Figure 6: Comparison between BREEAM and GBL results(new sections) for the building of C82.

are awarded by using BREEAM in comparison with 54% of the total scores (15.12 out of 28 as in Fig. 5) awarded by GBL (Fig.6).

The biggest difference between the two methods is the results for the section ‘water’ for the case study building. The reuse of water is highly prioritised by BREEAM, while the percentage of water saved is of concern in GBL. According to GBL requirements, saving water is a practice that has excellent potential for reducing consumption, so the case study building gets a high score for water (15.84 out of 18), while the corresponding score for BREEAM is only 3.1 out of 7 as shown in Figs4 and 5, respectively.

Regarding the section of material, both methods consider the percentage of recyclable materials used and the reduction of waste. BREEAM pays more value to low embodied impact materials over their life. Examining the item of materials 43% of the score is related to the total in BREEAM while the corresponding figure is 54% in GBL.

For indoor environment, limited evaluations of acoustic, lighting, thermal and air quality are assessed by both methods. BREEAM covers more details than GBL in the Indoor environment section in general and specifically in the containment and secure use. The case study building in BREEAM achieves only 6.13 points out of a maximum possible 15 representing 41% while in GBL scores 11.4 out of a maximum possible 19 representing 60%. The building has achieved a total score of 42.52 out of a possible available 88 points (Fig. 4) representing an overall achievement of 48% in BREEAM while the corresponding figures in GBL is around 64% (Fig. 5).

This paper analysed the environmental performance assessment of a case study office building by using two widely used assessment methods, i.e. BREEAM and GBL in China. Among the aims of the study was to compare GBL procedure and its results with those of BREEAM through using both methods in evaluating environmental performance of a case study office building under construction in China. In order to make comparisons between the two methods more compatible and meaningful, it was necessary to devise a new structure within which the credits can be redistributed to five main common sections applicable to both methods. These five new sections are landscape, energy and atmosphere, water, materials, indoor environment, respectively.

The comparison showed that the main objectives of BREEAM and GBL methods are very similar and that generally speaking their assessment and certification are relatively close. The

two methods, however, allocate different levels of emphasis to different assessment criteria. The results obtained are based on analyses carried out for one case study office building in China and hence cautious should be exercised when applying the results universally.

REFERENCES

- [1] Urge-Vorsatz, D., Harvey, L.D.D., Mirasgedis, S. & Levine, M.D., Mitigating CO₂ emissions from energy use in the world's buildings. *Building Research & Information*, **35**(4), pp.379–398, 2007.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09613210701325883>
- [2] Asif, M., Muneer, T. & Kelly, R., Life cycle assessment: a case study of a dwelling home in Scotland. *Building and Environment*, **42**(3), pp.1391–1394, 2007.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2005.11.023>
- [3] United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), Buildings: Investing in Energy and Resource Efficiency. UNEP, 2011, available at www.unep.org/greenconomy/Portals/88/documents/ger/9.0_Buildings.pdf
- [4] Sodagar, B. & Fieldson, R., Towards a low carbon construction practice. *Construction Information Quarterly (CIQ) Journal Chartered Institute of Building (CIOB)*, **10**(3), pp.101–108, 2008.
- [5] Fieldson, R., Rai, D. & Sodagar, B., Towards a framework for early estimation of life-cycle carbon footprinting of buildings in the UK. *Construction Information Quarterly (CIQ) Journal, Chartered Institute of Building (CIOB)*, **11**(2), pp. 66–75, 2009.
- [6] Sun, F., Sodagar, B. & Bell, J., Building heating consumptions under present and future climate scenarios. *PLEA2013 of the 29th Conference on Sustainable Architecture for a Renewable Future*, Germany, 2013.
- [7] Brunsgaard, C., Dvořáková, P., Wyckmans, A., Stutterecker, W., Laskari, M., Almeida, M., Kabele, K., Magyar, Z., Bartkiewicz, P. & Op't Veld, P., Integrated energy design - Education and training in cross-disciplinary teams implementing energy performance of buildings directive (EPBD). *Building and Environment*, **72**, pp.1–14, 2014.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2013.10.011>
- [8] Sharifi, A. & Murayama, A., A critical review of seven selected neighborhood sustainability assessment tools. *Environ Impact Assessment Review*, **38**, pp.73–87, 2013.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.eiar.2012.06.006>
- [9] Haapio, A. & Viitaniemi, P., A critical review of building environmental assessment tools. *Environ Impact Assessment Review*, **28**(7), pp.469–482, 2008.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.eiar.2008.01.002>
- [10] Ali, H.H. & Al Nsairat, S.F., Developing a green building assessment tool for developing countries- case of Jordan. *Build Environment*, **44**(5), pp.1053–1064, 2009.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2008.07.015>
- [11] Ortiz, O., Castells, F. & Sonnemann, G., Sustainability in the construction industry: a review of recent developments based on LCA. *Construction Building Materials*, **23**(1), pp. 28–39, 2009.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2007.11.012>
- [12] Suzer, O., A comparative review of environmental concern prioritization: LEED vs other major certification systems. *Environmental Management*, **154**, pp. 266–283, 2015.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2015.02.029>
- [13] Krause, A.L. & Bitter, C., Spatial econometrics, land values and sustainability: trends in real estate valuation research. *Cities*, **29**(2), pp.19–25, 2012.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2012.06.006>

- [14] Ford, B., Schiano-Phan, R.&Zhongcheng, D., The passivhaus standard in European warm climates, Passive-on Project, www.eerg.it/passiveon.org/CD/1.%20Technical%20Guidelines/Part%203/Part%203.pdf
- [15] ZabalzaBribian, I., ArandaUson, A. &Scarpellini, S., Life cycle assessment in buildings: state-of-the-art and simplified LCA methodology as a complement for building certification. *Building Environment*, **44**(12), pp.2510–2520, 2009.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2009.05.001>
- [16] BREEAM,available at www.breeam.com/why-breeam
- [17] LEED,available at www.usgbc.org/leed
- [18] Green star,available at www.gbca.org.au/faq/green-star
- [19] CASBEE, available at www.ibec.or.jp/CASBEE
- [20] Fieldson, R. & Smith, B., Gathering diverse and complex energy use data for monitoring and analysis. *London Business Conferences*,2007available at www.researchgate.net/publication/237665752
- [21] Sodagar, B., Fieldson, R. & Gilroy Scott, B., Design for sustainable architecture and environments. *The International Journal of Environmental Cultural Economic & Social Sustainability*, **4**(4), pp.73–84, 2007.
- [22] MOHURD, available at www.mohurd.gov.cn/
- [23] Schwartz, Y.&Raslan, R., Variations in results of building energy simulation tools, and their impact on BREEAM and LEED ratings: a case study. *Energy & Buildings*, **62**(7), pp. 350–359, 2013.
- [24] Ministry of Housing Urban-Rural Development (MOHURD), GB50189-2015: Design standard for energy efficiency of public buildings. MOHURD, China, pp.11–15, 2014.
- [25] NCM, National Calculation Methodology (NCM) Modeling Guide. Building Research Establishment Ltd, 2013.



Transactions of the Wessex Institute

An Essential Collection

The **Transactions of the Wessex Institute** collection features the leading, reviewed papers presented at the Institute's selected international conferences and other papers published by WIT Press covering specialized engineering and scientific topics. They respond to the needs of the research community by providing rapid access to scientific and technical information.

The collection continues to increase in size and prominence, with new additions each year to the papers published since 1993.

Real Depth and Scope

Consisting of approximately 30,000 papers, the collection is divided into three core research areas.

Up to Date

With access to the latest research and nearly 30,000 articles, with thousands more added every year.

Transactions of the Wessex Institute

Prestigious collection

- ◆ Access to the latest research
- ◆ Real depth and scope
- ◆ Peer reviewed
- ◆ Simple to use

Simple to Use

Full text access is available via PDF, with the facility of basic, advanced and author search options.

Subject Areas Covered

WIT Transactions on the Built Environment

Acoustics, Architecture, Earthquake Engineering, Geomechanics & Geo-Environment, Marine & Offshore Engineering, Structural Engineering & Transport Engineering, Risk Analysis, Heritage Architecture

WIT Transactions on Ecology and the Environment

Air Pollution, Design & Nature, Ecology, Sustainable Development, Environmental Engineering, Environmental Health & Water Resources, Energy Resources, Bioengineering, Human Health, Biosciences

WIT Transactions on Engineering Sciences

Damage & Fracture Mechanics, Electrical Engineering & Electromagnetics, Fluid Mechanics, Heat Transfer, Materials & Manufacturing, Mathematics & Statistics, Information Technologies, Complex Systems Boundary Elements & Meshless Reduction Methods & Numerical Methods for Engineering

BOOKS from WIT^{PRESS}

The following titles can be ordered from:

WIT Press, Ashurst Lodge, Ashurst, Southampton, SO40 7AA, UK

Tel: 44 (0) 238 029 3223 Fax: 44 (0) 238 029 2853

Email: marketing@witpress.com www.witpress.com

The Sustainable City X Urban Regeneration and Sustainability

*Edited by: C.A. BREBBIA, Wessex Institute of Technology, UK and
W.F. FLOREZ-ESCOBAR, Universidad Pontificia Bolivariana, Colombia*

Containing the proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Urban Regeneration and Sustainability this book addresses the multidisciplinary aspects of urban planning today - a result of the increasing size of cities, the amount of resources and services required, and the complexity of modern society.

Most of earth's population now lives in cities and the process of urbanisation continues generating many problems deriving from the drift of the population towards them. These problems can be resolved by cities becoming efficient habitats, saving resources in a way that improves the quality and standard of living. The process, however, faces a number of major challenges, related to reducing pollution and improving main transportation and infrastructure systems.

These challenges contribute to the development of social and economic imbalances and require the development of new solutions that optimise the use of space and energy resources and improve the environment, i.e. reduction in air, water and soil pollution and more efficient waste management. Large cities are probably the most complex mechanisms to manage. However, despite such complexity they represent a fertile ground for architects, engineers, city planners, social and political scientists, and other professionals able to conceive new ideas and time them according to technological advances and human requirements. The challenge of planning sustainable cities lies in considering their dynamics, the exchange of energy and matter, and the function and maintenance of ordered structures directly or indirectly, supplied and maintained by natural systems.

Covers topics such as: Planning, development and management; The community and the city; Urban strategies; Architectural issues; Cultural heritage issues; Landscape planning and design; Urbanisation of rural areas; Environmental management; Sustainable energy and the city Transportation; Waste management; Intelligent environments; Quality of life Infrastructures and social services; Sustainable urban tourism; Planning for risk and natural hazards.



WIT Transactions on Ecology and the Environment, Vol 194

ISBN: 978-1-84564-942-5

e-ISBN: 978-1-84564-943-2

Published 2015 / 504pp / £217.00



WESSEX INSTITUTE
ADVANCING INTERNATIONAL
KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER

Conferences 2017

COASTAL CITIES 2017

2nd International Conference on Coastal Cities and their Sustainable Future
24–26 April, 2017, Cadiz, Spain
witconferences.com/coastal2017

AIR POLLUTION 2017

25th International Conference on Modelling, Monitoring and Management of Air Pollution
25–27 April, 2017, Cadiz, Spain
witconferences.com/air2017

ECOSUD 2017

11th International Conference on Ecosystems and Sustainable Development
26–28 April, 2017, Cadiz, Spain
witconferences.com/ecosud2017

STREMAH 2017

15th International Conference on Studies, Repairs and Maintenance of Heritage Architecture
9–11 May, 2017, Istanbul, Turkey
witconferences.com/stremah2017

BIM 2017

2nd International Conference on Building Information Modelling (BIM) in Design, Construction and Operations
10–12 May, 2017, Istanbul, Turkey
witconferences.com/bim2017

WATER & SOCIETY 2017

4th International Conference on Water & Society
5–7 June 2017, Seville, Spain
witconferences.com/wsoc2017

DISASTER MANAGEMENT 2017

5th International Conference on Disaster Management and Human Health Risk: Reducing Risk, Improving Outcomes
7–9 June 2017, Seville, Spain
witconferences.com/disaster2017

TIMBER STRUCTURES 2017

1st International Conference on Timber Structures and Engineering
13–15 June 2017, The New Forest, UK
witconferences.com/timber2017

MULTIPHASE FLOW 2017

9th International Conference on Computational & Experimental Methods in Multiphase & Complex Flow
20–22 June 2017, Tallinn, Estonia
witconferences.com/multiphase2017

CONTACT AND SURFACE 2017

13th International Conference on Computational Methods and Experiments in Surface & Contact Mechanics
21–23 June 2017, Tallinn, Estonia
witconferences.com/contact2017

MATERIALS CHARACTERISATION 2017

8th International Conference on Computational Methods and Experiments in Material Characterisation
21–23 June 2017, Tallinn, Estonia
witconferences.com/materials2017

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING 2017

9th International Conference on Sustainable Development and Planning
27–29 June 2017, Bristol, UK
witconferences.com/sdp2017

CMEM 2017

18th International Conference on Computational Methods and Experimental Measurements
4–6 July 2017, Alicante, Spain
witconferences.com/cmем2017

ERES 2017

11th International Conference on Earthquake Resistant Engineering Structures
5–7 July 2017, Alicante, Spain
witconferences.com/eres2017

WATER RESOURCES MANAGEMENT 2017

9th International Conference on Sustainable Water Resources Management
18–20 July 2017, Prague, Czech Republic
witconferences.com/wrm2017

RIVER BASIN MANAGEMENT 2017

9th International Conference on River Basin Management Including all aspects of Hydrology, Ecology, Environmental Management, Flood Plains and Wetlands
19–21 July 2017, Prague, Czech Republic
witconferences.com/rbm2017

URBAN TRANSPORT 2017

23rd International Conference on Urban Transport and the Environment
5–7 September 2017, Rome, Italy
witconferences.com/transport2017

SAFE 2017

7th International Conference on Safety and Security Engineering
6–8 September 2017, Rome, Italy
witconferences.com/safe2017

SUSTAINABLE CITY 2017

12th International Conference on Urban Regeneration and Sustainability
18–20 September 2017, Seville, Spain
witconferences.com/city2017

ENERGY AND SUSTAINABILITY 2017

7th International Conference on Energy and Sustainability
20–22 September 2017, Seville, Spain
witconferences.com/esus2017

wessex.ac.uk

Subscription Order Form

Subscribe to receive your 2017 issues of the Journal in printed format, plus free access to the electronic versions of all issues of the previously published Journal.

Complete this form, or alternatively visit www.witpress.com/journals. The **International Journal of Sustainable Development and Planning** is issued 8 times a year at the subscription rate of **US\$1900.00**

Method of payment

- ☐ I am enclosing a **cheque** for:..... (Payable to ‘WIT Press Ltd’)
- ☐ I am making a **direct transfer** to Natwest Bank plc., 43 Commercial Road, Totton Southampton, Hampshire, SO40 3TU, UK. Sort Code: 53-81-23.

BIC/Swift Code: NWB KGB 2L \$ US Dollar IBAN: GB83NWBK60730110366067

- ☐ I wish to pay by **credit card** ☐Mastercard ☐Visa ☐American Express
- Card Number:..... Expiry Date:
- Credit Card Security Code: (3 digit number printed on card signature strip):.....
- Signature: Date:
- PLEASE NOTE: To process your order we need to have the registered name and address on your credit card. Please attach this information to this form if it is different from the name and address you are giving below.

Your Details

Please quote your VAT number (EC Countries only):

Name:

Position:

Organisation:.....

Address:

.....

RETURN ADDRESS

Please return this form to: **Lorraine Carter**, WIT Press, Ashurst Lodge, Ashurst, Southampton, SO40 7AA, UK. Tel: +44 (0) 238 029 3223 Fax: +44 (0) 238 029 2853
E-mail: lcarter@witpress.com

Customers in the USA, Canada and Mexico please return your order form to:
Linda Ouellete, Customer Service Manager, WIT Press, 25 Bridge Street, Billerica, MA 01821, USA. Tel: +1 978 667 5841 Fax: +1 978 667 7582
E-mail: infoUSA@witpress.com



THE KNOWLEDGE CENTRE of The Wessex Institute of Technology *The essential gateway to the latest scientific research*

The Knowledge Centre of the Wessex Institute of Technology provides information on the latest scientific and technological research through a series of locations detailed below.



INTERNATIONAL JOURNALS www.witpress.com/journals

The following journals are published by WIT Press:

International Journal of Sustainable Development and Planning
International Journal of Design & Nature and Ecodynamics
International Journal of Safety and Security Engineering
International Journal of Computational Methods and Experimental Measurements
International Journal of Energy Production and Management
International Journal of Heritage Architecture
International Journal of Transport Development and Integration

All papers are archived in the above site where they can be accessed by the community.

TRANSACTIONS OF THE WESSEX INSTITUTE www.witpress.com/elibrary

With nearly 30,000 papers available online, the Transactions of Wessex Institute collection offers a rapid and efficient way for researchers and academics to access the material delivered at the Institute's prestigious conferences.

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE PROGRAMME www.wessex.ac.uk/conferences

This site contains information on past and forthcoming international conferences organised by the Wessex Institute of Technology and other associated institutions in many different locations around the world. The meetings provide friendly and congenial means to achieve a high level of interaction amongst the participants. The emphasis is on high quality presentations which are afterwards published in the Transactions of Wessex Institute.

WIT PRESS BOOK STORE www.witpress.com

This contains books published by WIT Press and written and edited by leading specialists which enable researchers, engineers, scientists and managers to be aware of the latest developments in the field.



The International Journal of Sustainable Development and Planning is published by:

WIT Press, Ashurst Lodge, Ashurst, Southampton, SO40 7AA, UK

Tel: 44 (0) 238 029 3223; Fax: 44 (0) 238 029 2853; E-Mail: witpress@witpress.com, www.witpress.com

For USA, Canada and Mexico

WIT Press International, 25 Bridge Street, Billerica, MA 01821, USA

Tel: 978 667 5841; Fax: 978 667 7582; E-Mail: infousa@witpress.com, www.witpress.com

ISSN: 1743-761X (on line) and ISSN: 1743-7601 (paper format)

No responsibility is assumed by the Publisher, the Editors and Authors for any injury and/or damage to persons or property as a matter of products liability, negligence or otherwise, or from any use or operation of any methods, products, instructions or ideas contained in the material herein.

© WIT Press 2017

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the Publisher.



International Journal of Sustainable Development and Planning

Encouraging a unified approach to achieve sustainability

CONTENTS Volume 12, Number 3, 2017

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>357 Improving urban accessibility: a methodology for urban dynamics analysis in smart, sustainable and inclusive cities
<i>R. Pérez-DelHoyo et al.</i></p> <p>368 Assessment of sustainable neighbourhoods: from standards to cultural practices
<i>C. Doussard</i></p> <p>379 Between the transfer of development rights and the equivalency values: the case study of Natal, Brazil
<i>P. Italo dos Santos Galvão</i></p> <p>388 Shareable city, regenerated by making
<i>C. Cellucci & M. Di Sivo</i></p> <p>395 Reforging spatial identity for social sustainability
<i>R. Barelkowski</i></p> <p>406 The reorganization of development rights at inter-municipal level: different scenarios for an alternative land-use forecast in Seriana Valley in Italy
<i>L. Lazzarini & C. Chiarini</i></p> <p>416 Sustainable cities: an analysis of the contribution made by renewable energy under the umbrella of urban metabolism
<i>A. Barragán & J. Terrados</i></p> <p>425 Driving functions for urban sustainability: the double-edged nature of urban tourism
<i>R. Fistola & R.A. La Rocca</i></p> <p>435 The role of business incubators in the development of sustainable clusters of cultural and creative industries
<i>A. Romein & J.J. Trip</i></p> <p>446 Urban facilities management: a systemic process for achieving urban sustainability
<i>Luke Boyle & Kathy Michell</i></p> <p>457 'The management indicator' from the point of view of an urban assessment
<i>J.E.R. Nieto et al.</i></p> <p>468 Continuity and adaptability: a collaborative, Eco-Industrial Park (EIP)-focused approach to managing Small Town Community (STC) sustainability
<i>Richard Cawley</i></p> <p>477 Social conflicts in coastal touristic cities. Holistic renovation of buildings in Benidorm
<i>V. Echarri & M. Mas</i></p> | <p>488 Green coastal zones: nodes and connectors as strategy of urban regeneration
<i>J. Tuset</i></p> <p>498 The challenges on spatial continuity of urban regeneration projects: the case of Fener Balat historical district in Istanbul
<i>D. Erbey & A.E. Erbas</i></p> <p>508 Non-financial compensations: a proposal to refurbish the old residential buildings in Benidorm (Spain)
<i>Armando Ortuño Padilla</i></p> <p>517 Planning and management challenges of tourism in natural protected areas in Baja California, Mexico
<i>R. Rojas-Caldelas et al.</i></p> <p>528 Comparative analysis of environmental performance of an office building using BREEAM and GBL
<i>Wei Cheng et al.</i></p> <p>541 From Ecocity to Ecocampus: sustainability policies in university campuses
<i>L.A. Sandoval Hamón et al.</i></p> <p>552 Smart monitoring of benzene through an urban mobile phone network
<i>Luca Dalla Valle et al.</i></p> <p>559 Evolution as a kaleidoscope: experiences of resiliency and relevancy in Lethbridge, Canada
<i>P. Stein</i></p> <p>570 CITYOPT planning tool for energy efficient cities
<i>Pekka Tuominen et al.</i></p> <p>580 Supporting carbon neutrality in urban environments using positive energy buildings
<i>Charles Rau</i></p> <p>589 Functional aspects of modern and ancient pedestrian mobility on historic stone pavements
<i>E. Cepolina et al.</i></p> <p>599 Assessment of tax burden on the ownership and use of road passenger transport in Russia
<i>I. Mayburov & Y. Leontyeva</i></p> <p>606 Exploring affordances of the street
<i>A. Furman</i></p> |
|---|--|

ISSN: 1743-7601 (print)
ISSN: 1743-761X (online)

Email: witpress@witpress.com
www.witpress.com